

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

<div>SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION,</div> <div>Plaintiff-Applicant,</div> <div>v.</div> <div>BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT SECURITIES LLC,</div> <div>Defendant.</div>	<div>Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (CGM)</div> <div>SIPA LIQUIDATION</div> <div>(Substantively Consolidated)</div>
<div>In re:</div> <div>BERNARD L. MADOFF,</div> <div>Debtor.</div>	
<div>IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee for the Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC,</div> <div>Plaintiff,</div> <div>v.</div> <div>BANCO GENERAL, S.A., and BG VALORES, S.A., f/k/a WALL STREET SECURITIES, S.A.</div> <div>Defendants.</div>	<div>Adv. Pro. No. 12-01048 (CGM)</div>

**NOTICE OF JOINDER IN OBJECTING DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION  
TO THE TRUSTEE'S MOTION FOR ORDER AMENDING ORDER  
APPOINTING A DISCOVERY ARBITRATOR PURSUANT TO  
BANKRUPTCY RULE 9019(c) AND GENERAL ORDER M-390**

Defendants Banco General, S.A., and BG Valores, S.A., f/k/a Wall Street Securities, S.A., (collectively, “Defendants”) in Adv. Pro. No. 12-01048 (CGM), hereby object to the Motion for Order Amending Order Appointing a Discovery Arbitrator Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9019(c) and General Order M-390, filed in Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (CGM), ECF 23449, 23454 (“Trustee’s Motion”), by Irving H. Picard, as trustee for the liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC and the estate of Bernard L. Madoff (“Trustee”), and joins in all aspects of the Opposition to the Trustee’s Motion, ECF No. 23516, filed by the Objecting Defendants, except for ¶¶ 8, 19, 32-38 and the final sentence of the Conclusion paragraph.

Defendants are parties to one of the adversary proceedings, referred to by the Trustee as the Subsequent Transfer Cases, in which the Case Management Plan does not provide for mandatory discovery arbitration, and as such, the fallback position advocated by Objecting Defendants in their Opposition – that, at a minimum, the Court deny the Trustee’s Motion only with respect to adversary proceedings with previously entered Case Management Plans that (1) provide for mandatory discovery arbitration and (2) cite the existing Order Appointing Discovery Arbitrator – would not be adequate to protect the rights of Defendants, which are in all other relevant respects identically situated to the Objecting Defendants.

Because the Trustee has failed to justify the modification to the Order Appointing Discovery Arbitrator he seeks, under either Rule 60(b)(5) or Rule 60(b)(6), the Trustee’s Motion should be denied in its entirety as to all defendants who are parties to the Subsequent Transfer cases.

Dated: New York, New York  
May 1, 2023

BUTZEL LONG, P.C.

By: /s/ Joshua E. Abraham  
Joshua E. Abraham  
477 Madison Avenue, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
Telephone: (212) 347-5370  
[abraham@butzel.com](mailto:abraham@butzel.com)

*Attorneys for Defendants Banco General,  
S.A., and BG Valores, S.A., f/k/a Wall Street  
Securities, S.A.*